Smith's Report

Number 29 DECEMBER 1995

Bradley R. Smith
P.O. Box 3267
Visalia CA 93278

T: 209.627.8757
F: 209.733.2653
E-mail: brsmith@valleynet.com

Address for CODOH's World Wide Web site --- http://www.valleynet.com/~brsmith

Friend:

Here we are in the middle of another holiday season. I have lots of good news about the Campus Internet Project, but there's something on my mind I want to clear. That's one thing holidays are for, to get your mind off what it's regularly on and on to something else. I have been thinking about apologizing for a number of things, sort of like a New Year's resolution, but instead of making promises for the year not yet here, I would apologize for some of what I did or did not do but should have during the year now coming to a close.

About ten-thirty this morning I went out walking to reflect on this letter. There must be many cultural precedents for what I was thinking of doing but I couldn't think of any. Some primitive band of hunters and gatherers in the Amazon basin probably have it this little ritual worked out with great elaboration. Apology contains a request -- for forgiveness. You want to apologize, and beyond that you want to be forgiven for having been bad.

It is being increasingly pointed out to me that I am not the one to referee scholarly or any other debates among revisionists. I don't have enough interest in historical research, I don't want to take the time to understand the arguments of engineers and chemists and worse, I'm careless. I encourage others to say whatever they want about me, I find it interesting. I have the hide of a hippo. But then I'm inclined to allow others to say whatever they want about others as well, to shoot from the hip if they like, get it off their chests. Being careless and not being particularly sensitive about being insulted may work for me, but it doesn't work for very many others.

From the start my interest has been with the ethical and moral issues raised by the suppression of revisionist theory, not in the theory itself. Helplessly self-absorbed and egotistical, as E.B. White described his own personality, I have been fascinated with how arguing against the suppression of public debate on revisionist issues affects, and reveals, the subjective life. I suppose my pursuit of these revelations at the expense of what others would prefer me to do will prove to be either the catastrophe of my life or its saving grace.

The primary story I have to make some effort to set right revolves around how I handled the differences between Professor Robert Faurisson-and independent researcher David Cole. My effort here is not be to try to straighten out the story itself in any final way, but to demonstrate the kinds of errors, misjudgments and oversights I can make when I get involved as a referee in the disputes of others.

SR19 (Winter 95) I write an article on David Cole being set up and robbed at the Struthof (Natzweiler) gas chamber exhibit.

SR 21 (March 95). I publish a half-column letter by Robert Faurisson in which he points out that Rene Fabre, Dean of Pharmacology Faculty in Paris, concluded as long ago as 1945 that there had been no gassings at Struthof, apparently to suggest that there is no point in Cole being exercised over Struthof.

I run a 7 1/'2 column response by Cole pointing to many irregularities in the Struthof story and questioning Faurisson's good faith in trying to downplay them. But I fail to take note of which Cole article Faurisson is replying to on the one hand, and which Cole believes he is replying to.

SR 22 (April 95) Technically, there is no Smith's Report 22. In it's place I write a four-page lamentation spelling out how I have lost my two primary sources of funding, that it is almost certain I will be unable to continue with the Campus Project and will from that moment forward, without giving up revisionism entirely, concentrate on my book manuscripts.

I attach to these four pages a "Supplement to Smith's Report. Number 21 (Supplement) April 1995).) Here I print a one-page letter by Henri Roques giving his version

of what happened with Cole at Struthof, and arguing against the idea that Cole had in any way been "entrapped" or, as Cole strongly suspects, that the camp guards had participated in the robbery in one way or another. In the subtext there is the clear implication that Cole is lying about his experience.

Cole responds with an 8-page single-spaced letter, the opening remarks of which include: "The charges made by monsieur Roques don't interest me nearly as much as the history behind this missive. . . . Since I became known as part of the revisionist "movement," [Professor Robert] Faurisson has been relentless in his personal attacks against me."

The letter is a strong attack on Faurisson, not only on his scholarship but his character. I can't run the entire 8 pages, even if I had wanted to. I run the first page and include a notice saying I will send the full 8 pages to anyone who requests them. At the same time, I am so distracted by the financial catastrophe that I see bearing down on me, particularly the fact that I might have to institutionalize my mother and move the rest of the family to Mexico, that while I am more than a little disturbed by what is happening between Faurisson and Cole, I failed to keep my mind on it.

Cole now sends me a rewrite of the 8-page letter. It is now a 16 page elaboration of the original 8-pager. He's thrown himself into his work. He asks that I replace the 8-pager with the 16-pager. I do. Those who ask for the original 8-pager receive the 16-pager in its place. A couple readers suggest I must have a private reason for suppressing the original 8-page draft.

Meanwhile, I'm unaware that Faurisson has not received my letter of lametation (which I now refer to as SR22), nor the supplement containing the Roques letter, nor the first page of Cole's 8-pager.

SR 23 (May 95).I am sending Cole's 16-page attack on Faurisson to everyone on principle. By now I see it has some language a responsible editor would have taken care of. Now it's too late. I write a two-column article giving the background to the dispute, but I am still unaware that Faurisson has not received issues 22 and 23 of SR. Cole, of course, is also unaware of this. For other reasons, Cole criticizes me sharply for writing contemptuously of "survivors" like Wiesel and Mermelstein but in my exchanges with Cole attempt to protect Faurisson, a charge which I see has some merit. Somewhere down the line I will have to explain myself.

I run a one-column-plus letter by Carlos Porter criticizing Cole's article on Struthof.

SR 24 (June / July95) I do an entire newsletter without mentioning Faurisson or Cole.

SR 25 (August 95) Here I run a one-column open letter from Faurisson on a matter unrelated to his dispute with Cole. I run a three-column article by Cole on Struthof and his reasons for believing it is highly likely that 87 Jews were gassed at Struthof, largely in response to the letter I had run by Carlos Porter is SR 23. Cole observes that revisionists, when the chips are down, do not want to examine the evidence for gassing chambers any more than exterminationists do.

SR 26 (September 95) I run a letter from Professor Faurisson dated 10 August stating clearly he has just received "Smith's Report #25 (August 1995). He observes that "David Coles text on the `highly likely' allegation that Jews were gassed at Struthof: Cole did not give us one word on Professor Rene Fabre's testimony! Not one word on Pressac's allusions to it in his *Struthof Album!*."

SR 27 (October 95) I receive a blistering 700-word letter from David Cole. "Faurisson says I did not give `one word' on Professor Fabre's testimony. Agreed; I did not write `one word.' *I wrote 291 words!*" I don't run Cole's letter because of it's intemperate nature. I write that Faurisson made a "demonstrably inaccurate statement" when he wrote that Cole did not mention Fabre.

I receive an email letter from a Chicago reader who chides me for being asleep at the switch. When Faurisson wrote that Cole had ignored Fabre, Faurisson was referencing Cole's article in SR 25, which is plainly stated in Faurisson's letter and where, as a matter of fact, Cole indeed does not refer to Fabre.

Cole had gotten the dates of his own articles mixed up. As the editor, I should have caught that. That's what editors are for. Faurisson's SR 26 letter about Fabre clearly referenced Cole's SR 25 article, whereas Cole's "291 words" about Fabre had appeared in SR 21. So it turns out that I, not Faurisson, am the one who made the "demonstrably inaccurate statement."

Faurisson now asks why I have not printed Roque's letter about David Cole at Struthof in Smith's Report? I did print it -- as a supplement to SR 21, and I attached it to my letter of lamentation (now identified as SR 22). It is now that I learn that Faurisson did not receive SR 22 and SR 23. If he did not get SR 22, that means he did not receive the Supplement to SR 21 which contained the Roques letter, and the first page of Cole's 8-page (then 16-page) attack on him. If I had been on top of things editorially, I would have understood all this weeks and maybe months earlier. It's becoming increasingly clear that because of my inattention to my editorial responsibilities I have played a key role in the growing dispute between Cole and Faurisson, when all my inclinations would be to help work things out between them.

There is a great deal more I could report on all this but this is it for me. I think the outline is clear. There is a serious dispute going on between Faurisson and Cole, and that I have played a significant role in forwarding it. The

one productive thing that has come from this miserable affair is that I have learned I am absolutely not the right person to referee scholarly or scientific disputes among revisionists or anyone else, in a forum such as this one. My apologies to all concerned. If there's anything I can do to help reverse what I have already done, I'm all ears.

THE CODOH WORLD-WIDE-WEB SITE LOGGED ONTO MORE THAN 1,500 TIMES IN FIRST SIX WEEKS.

But who's counting? Me. On Saturday morning, 28 October, I checked to see if we had the "counter" on my Homepage. Three individuals had logged onto the site up to that hour. I was there at the very beginning. The next morning the count had gone to 12. Some of the hits (visits) were probably by Richard Widmann or D. Thomas doing technical work.

The next morning there was a total of 18 hits registered. By the end of the week the total had grown to 147, or an average of 21 hits a day. The daily total rose slowly week by week until the first full week in December we were getting about 45 hits daily. Don't think I think this is good. My first goal is to have 100 hits a day then pause and look around at where we are. We have barely begun to promo the site. There has been no media whatever. Our ads are being rejected by college papers. Meanwhile, the amount of information on the site is growing substantially, becoming increasingly valuable to those who find us.

I could never have gotten this far this quickly by myself. The bulk of the work is being done by volunteers, particularly Richard Widmann and D. Thomas, including all the technical work. There were technical problems that came up at the beginning that would have taken me weeks to get on top of. And then there is the labor of carefully coding the materials into hypertext markup language (don't ask me) and posting them on the site. And now, one by one, others are beginning to volunteer their work. This is going to be something!

Following are some of the materials already on the site, any or all of which are available to be printed out and sent to you if you want to read them but do not have access to the Internet.

Gas Chambers and Gas Vans:

"Aerial Photo Surveillance of Auschwitz" by Andrew Allen. An introductory critique of the notorious "CIA" photos released in 1979.

"The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within a Myth," by Friedrich Paul Berg. Published previously in the *Journal For Historical Review*.

"Forty-Six Important Unanswered Questions Regarding the Nazi Gas Chambers" by David Cole. Based on Cole's first-hand examination of the physical remains of the "gas chambers." A nightmare for exterminationists.

"The "Gassed" People of Auschwitz: Pressac's New Revisions" by Carlo Mattogno. Mattogno's most recent review of Jean-Claude Pressac's work. This was provided us by Russ Granada, Mattogno's translator and agent in the U.S.

War Crimes Trials

"The Office of Special Investigations and the Holocaust Myth" by Andrew Allen. Allen dissects one "case" of an OSI investigation and raises serious questions about the agency's ethical standards.

"Creative Justice: Conviction Without Accusation - The Case of Schoepp and Gretscl." Carlos Porter, using testimony directly from the IMT, demonstrates briefly how such convictions can be won.

Not Guilty at Nuremberg: The German Defense Case by Carlos Porter. We've posted the entire 10,000 (+)-word essay. This was originally posted by Dan Gannon on his Oregon BBS. This newly (somewhat) updated and corrected text is being made available to *the world!*.

"When It's Confession Time at Dachau, or, I saw the Light While I was Seeing Stars." Porter uses IMT documents to demonstrate that in some instances German prisoners were beaten to obtain confessions.

The ThoughtCrimes Archive. Richard Widmann is collecting and editing this Archive. The "crimes" are listed by year and little by little will add up to a serious indictment against those who are forwarding the struggle against intellectual freedom in Western culture. Here are a few of the listings, which at this time go back to 1984 with the subject: "Arsonists Devastate Revisionist Publisher" The reader can find the story behind each heading by simply putting his screen cursor on the heading itself and tapping his "enter" key..

1992 Thugs Attack Revisionist Speaker at UCLA
France Convicts Two for Distributing Leaflet
Austrian Revisionist Convicted

Irving Fined 10,000 Marks
Computer Network Holocaust Debate Closed
German General Sentenced to Imprisonment

1995 House Historian Fired for Even-Handedness
Japanese Publisher Shut Down
German Publisher Forced to "Recycle" Book
German Publisher Raided
German Court Jails Deckert For Two Years
Zuendel's Headquarters Torched
Journalist Charged for Expressing Opinion
German-American Jailed for Writing Letter
German Court Jails Yuppie for Denying
Lawyer Attacked Outside Court
Deckert Arrested: Suspected of Writing Book
Man Convicted for Denying Knowledge of Gas Chambers
Swiss to Expel Christopher

Widmann introduces his archive by quoting George Orwell: "Anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy finds himself silenced with surprising effectiveness. A genuinely unfashionable opinion is almost never given a fair hearing." And he ends it by quoting Orwell again: "Thoughtcrime does not entail death: thoughtcrime IS death."

Book Reviews.

John Anderson reviews *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* by Deborah Lipstadt. "Ms Lipstadt openly and shamelessly tries to convince the reader that Holocaust deniers should never, under any conditions, be given an academic or public forum or access to the media of mass communication to present their viewpoint. To accomplish this she puts forth essentially two arguments which are woven throughout the entire fabric of this insidious work."

The Great Holocaust Trial by Michael A. Hoffman II is reviewed by Richard Widmann. "Hoffman, who writes with the grace of a romantic poet, draws his title from the 1985 trial or Ernst Zuendel. . . [and]. . . provides both background to the trial, by recounting biographical information about Zuendel, and foreground by detailing important post-trial events."

Break His Bones. I now have a contents page up for this work-in-progress, and three chapter-length excerpts. The chapter titles are followed by the year in which the action takes place.

"The Ruling Discourse (1995)
"Cardboard Germans, Cardboard Jews (1960)
"You Don't Have to be Jewish (1995)

The Tangled Web: Zionism and the Holocaust Story. Does the Holocaust story lead back to Zionism and through Zionism to communism?

"The Pro Red Orchestra Starts Tuning UP in the USA, 1941," by James J. Martin. Stalinsm prepares the bed for Zionism and it's most valuable propaganda lever. Another piece first published in *Journal for Historical Review*.

"The Dark Web Pages of Zionism" -- controversial articles from the World Wide Web itself. An inter-Jewish debate over the relative value and danger of Zionism to the Jewish community. "The relationship of Zionism and anti-Semitism," "The racist nature of Zionism," etc. etc.

I have only two ads running now announcing the site. One is in , *Fact Sheet Five* with a quarterly readership of some 40,000 mostly young people, appeared the last week in November. The second, *The Eccentric Monthly* with an audience of 110,000 on five college campuses in central Virginia (including Radford University), appeared the first week in December. The big battles over promoting the site in the college press and media has not been joined yet. The forces lined up to oppose to oppose us are huge, and better organized than ever before. It's going to be interesting. How will I get past them and around them and through their middle this time? Stay tuned. The next exciting chapter is coming soon.

And don't forget -- if you want print outs of any of the articles listed above from the CODOH Website, I can send them to you

My best wishes for the holidays and all the coming year.

Smith's Report is sent free to those who help with financial support, who monitor the press (including the college press) and send me relevant clippings, or who provide me with other kinds of information or help. If I hear from you, you'll hear from me. If you *should* hear from me but don't -- complain to Robin

Contributions, correspondence and information to

Bradley R. Smith
PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278
T: 209.627.8757 F: 209.733.2653